

Message

From: Puknat, William [WPuknat@mt.gov]
Sent: 4/25/2022 3:05:44 PM
To: Brumm, Peter [Brumm.Peter@epa.gov]
CC: Laidlaw, Tina [Laidlaw.Tina@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Cycle First Listed (CFL) + questions

Thank you Peter

William Puknat, PMP | *Computer Systems Analyst*
Information Management Bureau
Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Office: 406-444-6750



How did we do? >>

From: Brumm, Peter [mailto:Brumm.Peter@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2022 8:33 AM
To: Puknat, William <WPuknat@mt.gov>
Cc: Laidlaw, Tina <laidlaw.tina@epa.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Cycle First Listed (CFL) + questions

Hi Bill,

Sorry for the delayed response. All is good in my neighborhood. I hope the same is true in yours!

That is an interesting scenario but I could see how it's possible. I added my thoughts in red below and CC'd Tina to make sure my recs are in line with hers.

Let me know if you want to discuss my feedback further,

Peter Brumm
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region 8, Montana Office
10 West 15th Street, Suite 3200
Helena, MT 59626
(406)457-5029

From: Puknat, William <WPuknat@mt.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2022 3:42 PM
To: Brumm, Peter <Brumm.Peter@epa.gov>
Cc: Kron, Darrin <dkron@mt.gov>; Staten, Christina <CStaten@mt.gov>; Certalic, Ian <Ian.Certalic@mt.gov>
Subject: Cycle First Listed (CFL) + questions

Hello Peter,

Hope all is well.

I have a theoretical case that may occur sometime in the future and wanted to know the best way to handle this in our WARD system.

Scenario: a parameter (e.g. Lead) on a water segment (e.g. Deer creek) is a category 5 with a 2008 CFL. In 2016 a TMDL is approved and the category becomes 4a. In 2020 the segment is assessed and the parameter (Lead) now meets criteria (whether restored or other reason) and becomes a category 1. In 2030 Deer creek becomes impaired again for Lead and becomes a category 4a (or 5).

Question 1: Does the CFL remain 2008 or is it now 2030?

I think it should remain 2008, based on the logic that the "F" stands for "First" indicating the first time we had information to indicate there was a water quality issue. If we had a data element for CSL (Cycle Second Listed), I'd say that would be 2030.

Question 2: Should this resurrected parameter go to cat 4A since there is an existing TMDL? Or does it become a category 5.

It should go back to Cat 4a, unless something significant changed and the original TMDL is no longer protective of the WQS, like if the lead WQS became more stringent since the TMDL was written. Even while in Cat 1, EPA still encourages TMDLs to remain effective (i.e., not withdrawn) so it should be hanging out in the background and re-linked once the water became impaired again.

Question 3: If a cat 5, is a new TMDL required or just an addendum to the 2016 TMDL? What about the Action ID?

A new TMDL isn't required unless the old TMDL is no longer protective or settings on the ground significantly changed (new point source discharger that wasn't given a WLA in the original TMDL). If either of those cases exist, a withdraw/replace or an addendum should be perused, which would require a new Action ID since EPA would have to approve/act on those significant updates.

In WARD we can track events that happen to a waterbody/pollutant combination so we have a history of changes.

Regards,
Bill

William Puknat, PMP | *Computer Systems Analyst*
Information Management Bureau
Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Office: 406-444-6750



[\[gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com\]](mailto:gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com)



[\[gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com\]](mailto:gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com)



[\[gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com\]](mailto:gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com)



[\[gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com\]](mailto:gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com)

[\[gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com\]](mailto:gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com)

[\[gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com\]](mailto:gcc02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com)

How did we do? >>